

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-11, 13-15, and 17-19 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner with Claims 1, 12, and 16 standing cancelled.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

This rejection is traversed in part.

The Examiner alleges that Claim 11 lacks antecedent basis for 'said computerized bonder'.

However, the Examiner's attention is directed to now independent Claim 7 and cancelled Claim 1 where an antecedent basis for this phrase can be found.

The remaining claims have been amended to take into consideration the helpful comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action.

Claims 1-3 and 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurtz; Claims 1-6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bancroft; and Claims 12-16 and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Ogasawara.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Kurtz does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the train of EFO current pulses providing a continuous series of pulses of progressively lower heights yet various pulse widths.

The Examiner alleges that Kurtz discloses this feature at column 3, lines 41-47.

Notwithstanding the allegations of the Examiner, Kurtz discloses that the number of pulses or duration of the pulse train, the pulse width, or the duty cycle and the pulse height or amplitude maybe varied to precisely meter the delivered energy.

This does not disclose a continuous series of pulses of progressively lower heights.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Bancroft and Ogasawara does not relate to Claim 7.

Ogasawara does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the first, second, and the third pulses being successively applied.

The Examiner alleges that the three pulses are disclosed by the first duration (d-e), the second  $I_{SP}$ , and the second duration (b-c).

The order of these current waves does not correspond to the claimed invention.

Applicants appreciate the indication that if Claim 17 is rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and include the limitations of any base claim and any intervening claims, this claim would be allowable.

Claim 17 has been amended to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Furthermore, Claim 17 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Correspondingly, Applicants submit that Claim 17 is allowable.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-5633